

are at once distinguished by having the stems arise from a branching caudex, as in other forms of *S. ulmifolia*, instead of from long creeping rhizomes, as in *S. rugosa*. From the form of *S. rugosa* that occurs in its area it is further distinguished by its much thinner and scarcely rugose leaves, and longer softer pubescence, as well as by some less constant or less tangible features of habit.

Solidago yadkinensis (Porter) Small differs from *S. Boottii* Hook. chiefly in its slightly larger and broader heads (involucre mostly 3–4.5 mm. high in *S. Boottii*, 4.5–7 mm. in *S. yadkinensis*; rays mostly 2–5 in *S. Boottii*, 4–8 in *S. yadkinensis*). *S. yadkinensis* was originally described as a variety of *S. Boottii*, an interpretation in which I concur, since the differences are not great and many doubtful specimens exist. Unfortunately, Asa Gray's material of his *S. arguta* var. *caroliniana* seems taxonomically identical with *S. yadkinensis*, and his diagnosis further bears out the identity of the two. It therefore becomes necessary to transfer *S. arguta* var. *caroliniana* to *S. Boottii*.

SOLIDAGO BOOTTII Hook. var. **Boottii** Cronquist, var. nov. *S. Boottii* Hook. Comp. Bot. Mag. **1**: 97. 1835, sens. strict.

SOLIDAGO BOOTTII Hook. var. **caroliniana** (Gray) Cronquist, comb. nov. *S. arguta* Ait. var. *caroliniana* Gray, Syn. Fl. **1**, pt. **2**: 155. 1884.

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

SEDUM ROSEA, NOT *S. ROSEUM*.—The boreal Roseroot has long been passing erroneously under the name *Sedum roseum* "(L.)" Scop. but some American botanists seem to have overlooked the very clear discussion of the name by Sprague in Journ. Bot. lxxvii. 126 (1939), his obvious decision at once accepted by Mansfeld in Fedde, Repert. xlvi. 286 (1939) and by Wallace and Wilmott in Bot. Soc. Exch. Cl. Brit. Isl. Rep. xii. 253 (1942).

Briefly the case is this. The generico-specific name *Rosea*, coming from the apothecaries' *Rosea radix* or *Rhodia radix* (because of the fragrance of the bruised root), was formally taken up as of Rivinius in Ruppium, Fl. Jen. 80 (1718) and was used as a definite generic name by Kramer, Tent. Bot. 19 (1744). Linnaeus, Crit. Bot. 41 (1737) and Fl. Lapp. 304 (1737) replaced

"*Rosea*. Rupp. jen. I. p. 80" by *Rhodiola* and in Sp. Pl. 1035 (1753), adopting binomial nomenclature, called the plant *Rhodiola Rosea*. When the combination *Sedum roseum* was published by Scopoli (1772), the latter author did not grasp the fact that "*Rosea*" was an old generic name. Sprague argues that, Scopoli having mistaken it for an adjective, the plant "may, however, be cited as *Sedum Rosea* (L.) Scop., since the gender of a specific epithet may be corrected without changing the authority for the binary combination concerned." Sprague, it would seem, was too anxious to give Scopoli the credit. Since the basic *Rosea* was a noun in apposition, while *roseum* was an adjective, they can hardly be considered as the same word. The combination, I think, should stand as *Sedum Rosea* (L.) Scop. ex Sprague, l. c.

This binomial presents an interesting case for those self-styled "progressives" and standardizers (who are never progressive) who would destroy the clues to origins of specific names by uniformly decapitalizing them all. If they decapitalize *Rosea* and make it look like a feminine adjective (which it is not) they appear uninformed as to the gender of *Sedum*; if they insist on *Sedum roseum* they wholly misrepresent the truth. As L. H. Bailey, always looked upon as most truly progressive, well says: "A binomial is more than a name for a plant. It has history and significance. If decapitalization obscures this significance then it should be applied with caution. One who disregards the meanings is not sensitive to words, and he may deprive nomenclature of one of its interesting assets."—Bailey, *Gent. Herb.* vii. 171 (1946). He further says: "There is . . . no sense in [decapitalized] *Polygonum convolvulus*, *Daphne mezereum*, *Convolvulus soldanella*, *Acacia julibrissin*, *Jatropha manihot*, *Brassica pe-tsui*, *Phaseolus mungo*, *Psoralea onobrychis*, *Zea mays*" (Bailey, p. 172). All this was clearly understood by Linnaeus, Lamarck, Willdenow, the DeCandolles, the Hookers, Eichler, Kunth, Torrey, Gray, Engler and countless others (even Britton, Rydberg, and Small, in many ways radical rather than progressive), who have initiated real progress in the science, although, before doing so, they did not announce themselves as "progressives". They were truly progressive because their work demonstrated them to be so and because they had real respect for established

good usage and understanding of words. One is not a progressive merely by adopting that misused term as a mask for intellectual inertia or lack of linguistic insight, any more than the self-appointed candidate for political office is a statesman simply by so labelling himself. Some of the younger "progressives" who adopt that unearned tag and who often remind one of George W. Cable's creole boy who was called Crabiche because he made progress backwardly, would do well, if they are not superior to being instructed, to read and digest the whole discussion on "*Species-names with capital letters*" (Bailey, l. c. 168-174) by the always progressive dean of us all.—M. L. FERNALD.

THE OCCURRENCE OF *ELEOCHARIS NITIDA* IN THE LAKE SUPERIOR REGION

OLGA LAKELA

Eleocharis nitida Fernald, hitherto known from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Quebec and northern New Hampshire, appears to have a wide range in the Lake Superior region. In the interior it was first discovered in Superior, Wisconsin, by Dr. John W. Thomson, Jr., who sent a specimen to the writer. According to information on the label, the plants were growing in a wet area south of 920 N. 22nd St. "Cultivated in 1936," must refer to the site of the colony.

After this discovery, one could hardly suppress hopes of finding the species on the Duluth side of the extensive waterfront. However, in Minnesota, its occurrence was first known to the late Dr. F. K. Butters who, with Dr. Ernst Abbe, without knowledge of the Wisconsin plants, collected the species in August, 1944, near Tofte, Cook Co. Thus, the two known sites were some hundred miles apart. The occurrence of the plant somewhere between the terminal points of its known range seemed probable.

On July 13, 1946, the writer made an effort to study *E. nitida* in the known colony near Tofte. As the North Shore Highway 61 enters Cook Co., the upper side of the road becomes springy and there are long stretches of the ditch-bottom under shallow water or, in places, deep water with marshy aspect. Frequent